UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,854	09/09/2003	Kenneth M. Martin	IMM050B	2113
	7590 03/15/201 ARTMENT (51851)	EXAMINER		
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP 1001 WEST FOURTH STREET			PIZIALI, JEFFREY J	
	LEM, NC 27101	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/15/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/657,854	MARTIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Jeff Piziali	2629					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 08 March 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since a				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the con	nsideration and/or search (see NOT N); eer form for appeal by materially rec corresponding number of finally reje	E below); ducing or simplifying th					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.14. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proven.	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-15 and 33-38. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	ided below of appended.						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
	11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
	/Jeff Piziali/ Primary Examiner, Art U 10 March 2011	nit 2629					

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 10/657,854

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

The Applicant is thanked for the After-Final Amendment (filed on 8 March 2011).

However, if entered, the Applicant's proposed claim amendments would add at least the subject matter:

"receiving a sensor signal by a processor in communication with a memory, the sensor signal comprising a raw sensor value from a sensor, the raw sensor value associated with a position of a manipulandum in a range of motion; calculating an adjusted sensor value by the processor, the adjusted sensor value based at least in part on the raw sensor value and a compliance constant, the compliance constant predetermined based on a compliance between the sensor and the manipulandum; and outputting an output signal by the processor, the output signal comprising the adjusted sensor value" to claim 1;

"the adjusted sensor value is calculated based at least in part on a current output force" to claim 2;

"determining a closed-loop position-dependent force by the processor, the closed-loop position-dependent force based at least in part on the raw sensor value" to claim 3;

"filtering, by the processor, the raw sensor value for overshoot sensor values occurring at limits to the range of motion of the manipulandum" to claim 5;

"calibrating, by the processor, the range of motion of the manipulandum by adjusting minimum and maximum values of the range of motion based at least in part on an extent of motion of the manipulandum up to a designated time" to claim 6;

"normalizing, by the processor, the raw sensor value to a normalized range of motion, wherein the adjusted sensor value is further associated with the normalized raw sensor value" to claim 7:

"calculate an adjusted sensor value based at least in part on the raw sensor value and a compliance constant, the compliance constant predetermined based on a compliance between the sensor and the manipulandum; and output an output signal comprising the adjusted sensor value" to claim 8;

"a non-transitory computer-readable medium on which is encoded program code configured to cause a processor to execute a method comprising: receiving a sensor signal comprising a raw sensor value from a sensor, the raw sensor value associated with a position of a manipulandum in a range of motion; calculating an adjusted sensor value based at least in part on the raw sensor value and a compliance constant, the compliance constant predetermined based on a compliance between the sensor and the manipulandum" to claim 33; and

"the adjusted sensor value is calculated based at least in part on a current output force" to claim 34.

The proposed claim amendments, if incorporated into present claim language, would substantially alter inventive scope of the claims, requiring additional search and consideration.

Due to the proposed amendments not being entered, Applicant's arguments are not commensurate in scope with the current claims.

By such reasoning, non-entry of the proposed Amendment (filed on 8 March 2011) is deemed proper and necessary at this time.

/Jeff Piziali/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2629 10 March 2011